

**From:** Gordon Henley  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:42 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Gordon Henley (chenley@erols.com) writes:

RE:No on media deregulation

Please vote NO tomorrow on further media deregulation. It serves the interest of no one except big media businesses, and without any question, will limit public access to varied format, viewpoint and opinion.

As an example, have you actually LISTENED to what has happened to Washington radio since deregulation? Most of the sound, the content and the message is controlled by two or three big conglomerates like Clear Channel and Viacom. The ONLY reason that it is not completely devoid of value is that NPR and Bonneville (WTOP and WGMS) remain independent and highly rated. What would be left here if they were gone or not successful. Answer, NOT MUCH in the way of diversity. The radio deregulation rules were poorly thought through and accomplished nothing positive. Let's not repeat this mistake AGAIN.

Thank you

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 66.44.10.205  
Remote IP address: 66.44.10.205

**From:** Ngriffin40@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:42 PM  
**Subject:** Airways give away

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

FYI - I am utterly opposed to the passage of this rules change. I feel that concentrating ownership of the public airways is a dreadful mistake. Are we to let a couple of giants (Murdoch and Clear Channel) own everything that we listen to? It was bad enough that Clinton & Gore gave almost everything away - are you about to give the rest away? My vote is no!!!

Roland Dove  
1201 Bomar  
Houston Texas 77006  
rolanddove@hotmail.com

**CC:** Ngriffin40@aol.com

**From:** Roger37Owen@aol.com  
**To:** FCC FCCINFO, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:44 PM  
**Subject:** Competition

I know you've received countless e-mails and letters about your expected ruling on June 2 allowing greater concentration of media ownership; here's one more asking that you postpone this decision. Anything that is opposed by Jesse Jackson, the NRA, the Washington Post, John McCain, and the ACLU must have some fundamental flaws.

Thank you.

Roger Green  
Librarian  
Albany, NY

**From:** Ngriffin40@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:45 PM  
**Subject:** Air ways give away

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

FYI - I am utterly opposed to the passage of this rules change. I feel that concentrating ownership of the public airways is a dreadfull mistake. Are we to let a couple of giants (Murdoch and Clear Channel) own everything that we listen to? It was bad enough that Clinton & Gore gave almost everything away - are you about to give the rest away? My vote is no!!!

Roland Dove  
1201 Bomar  
Houston Texas 77006  
rolanddove@hotmail.com

**CC:** Ngriffin40@aol.com

**From:** qboy  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:50 PM  
**Subject:** Re: rules on ownership expansion

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am writing to urge you to vote against the motion to allow media providers to expand ownership beyond the limits currently allowed. I believe that monopolies in the media markets will destroy the "Market Place of Ideas"

I believe the 1996 changes have already provided evidence that unfettered giants in the media industry will only destroy the diversity in the market place by drastic consolidation.

This country needs more diversity of opinion and more local representation in the national forum, not less.

Quin Harris  
213 E 8th St, Houston, TX 77007  
281 748-5746  
qharris@mail.wt.net

**From:** Michael John Kelly  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 9:56 PM  
**Subject:** Please keep current Broadcast Ownership Rules as they are

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

I respectfully urge you to keep the broadcast ownership rules as they now stand.

I also encourage you and your fellow Commissioners to consider Senator John McCain's recently introduced Telecommunications Ownership Diversification Act of 2003, which encourages broadcast and telecommunications ownership by underrepresented groups like minorities, women and small businesses.

Democracy relies on an independent media. Relaxing or repealing the current broadcast ownership rules will result in large media conglomerates becoming larger, at the expense of local and independent media outlets. Americans will have access to fewer and fewer independent viewpoints. For the sake of American Democracy, you mustn't let this happen.

Sincerely,

Michael John Kelly  
Chicago, IL

**From:** matt kalin  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:01 PM  
**Subject:** Vote AGAINST further consolidation

The media is empowered by a sacred trust from the community.

Further consolidation of media ownership limits free speech and open debate.

Please vote AGAINST further consolidation.

**From:** Jack Weinberg  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:02 PM  
**Subject:** Media deregulation

I respectfully urge you to decline to deregulate media ownership or ease current regulations. Allowing a few giant media corporations to acquire more of the print and broadcast outlets is not in the public's interest.

I would also ask you to delay action pending hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Jack Weinberg  
Boise, Idaho



**From:** Dale Pontius  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:03 PM  
**Subject:** Adding my opposition to further deregulation

Hello,

Every few years when the local stations have their licenses up for renewal, they request feedback to the FCC to prove that they are using the airwaves for the public good. From past experience as a ham radio operator, I was under the impression that the FCC administered the RF spectrum for the public good.

I do not equate profits of media giants with the public good, and feel that diversity of opinion is critical for the operation of our democracy as well as our free market. Contrary to what seems to be current opinion, corporate good does not equal public good, in spite of the fact that there is some alignment because they provide employment.

As a citizen, I get an increasing feeling of powerlessness with the rise of "corporate rights". Our elected officials moan about decreasing election turnout, yet we get that distinct feeling of being at the bad end of "one buck, one vote."

As a consumer, I feel that the basis of the free market is that I remain informed and have choices. Media consolidation removes my choices as an information consumer. Furthermore, it increases someone else's control over my ability to be informed, lessening my market freedom in other areas.

Frustratedly yours,  
Dale Pontius

**From:** KQH  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:04 PM  
**Subject:** NO TO THE NEW FCC "REGULATIONS"

I am a concerned citizen who strongly opposes the new regulations that would allow media companies to own more outlets. IT IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE PUBLIC WHO YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO SERVE.

To sum things up:

[illegible]

Do you Yahoo!?  
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

**From:** Rasor, Noel Marie  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:04 PM  
**Subject:** Don't allow further media consolidation

Hello,

I am writing to express my profound concern that the FCC is planning to allow further media mergers which will place control of the nation's airwaves into still further hands. Free speech is too important to allow what is broadcast to be decided by ever smaller numbers of people. Please do not let this problem to grow worse.

Sincerely,  
Noel Rasor  
Lawrence, Kansas

**From:** Stephen Young  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:05 PM  
**Subject:** DON'T DO IT!

Dear Commissioner:

Please don't further limit free speech by allowing control of the public airwaves to go to fewer and fewer corporations; it would be the most Un-American thing you could do.

Signed,  
Stephen G Young  
Sarasota, Florida

**From:** Katherine Pincus  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:08 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Katherine Pincus (deadwoodfan@yahoo.com) writes:

Do not loosen standards. If you do this it will show that no one in this government cares about the needs of the American people. NO ONE but a handful of the very wealthy are for this (and not very many at that). Shame on you for even considering it.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.165.30.169  
Remote IP address: 24.165.30.169

**From:** Cynthia F. Baker  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:09 PM  
**Subject:** Against Further Media Ownership Consolidation

Dear Commissioner:

I am against further media ownership consolidation. Thank you.

Cynthia Baker  
Hollywood, FL

**From:** Archuleta  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:12 PM  
**Subject:** media ruling

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

I wish to share with you my extreme distress at the relaxation of FCC regulations concerning media control, and my concern that this will just open the flood gates to regulation of the content offered by the few companies that will own the greater part of communication and news sources. This may well be the start of completely controlled news, just as we see in dictatorships around the world today.

In the recent past media consolidation has resulted in a few major media concerns controlling 90 percent of what is presented to the U.S. public over the airwaves, to the detriment of diversity of news and the lack on major stations of presentation of many facts and of varying opinions. It is said that these changes would result in a mass of mergers similar to that following the deregulation of the FCC's radio ownership rules in 1996, which has left these few corporations in control of many of the nation's radio stations. We have already clearly seen that this will limit the content and ideas brought into the public sphere, especially at the local level. In our area one corporation owns most of the major radio stations. They present one point of view with such an obvious political slant that I am no longer interested in listening to the radio.

Apparently this entire program is based on simple monetary benefit to these large media concerns. Profitability is not a good reason for jeopardizing our democracy. This was wrong in 1996 and is blatantly wrong still; now and always.

Sincerely,

Kim Archuleta

**From:** urshula  
**To:** FCC FCCINFO, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:16 PM  
**Subject:** Do not ease US media ownership rules

Dear FCC Chairman & Commissioners,

I strongly disagree with any decision to ease US media ownership rules. Use sense instead of partisanship when making "your" decision on behalf of all of us.

Urshula Barbour  
Pure+Applied  
281 Avenue C  
New York, NY 10009



**From:** Nancy Binder  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:21 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Nancy Binder (ndbinder@ameritech.net) writes:

WHAT ARE YOU THINKING??? How can you live with yourself knowing that you may breach the public trust with such an ethical violation of your duties?

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.72.192.43  
Remote IP address: 66.72.192.43

**From:** Dorothy Wright  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:24 PM  
**Subject:** FCC regulations

Please do not change the media regulations. We are all against any change such as you are considering.

**From:** Laura  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:29 PM  
**Subject:** Are they allowed to do this?

Who governs what TV stations can play before and during prime time? I do not watch a great deal of TV. Tonight, I happened to be watching UPN65 - a local station (Orlando)!!!! - and saw a commercial advertising "Extreme Dating." What was on the commercial was quite disturbing, considering kids could easily be watching it if their parents do not police what they are watching. Luckily, in our house, we do pay attention to what our kids watch and make sure trash like that is not on OUR schedule.

During the commercial, THE COMMERCIAL, "Playing dressup" was the theme and the woman was clad only in see-through lingerie, two or three different outfits were shown, and at one point, the guy was on top of her laying down on the floor acting like he was having sex with her. And what time was this supposed to be on? 5:30. And if this was the commercial, what family friendly (NOT!!!!) action is happening during the rest of the show?

Who is being responsible in terms of their programming? Obviously no one.

I tried to get onto their website to lodge some kind of complaint, but they give no option that I could find to share my concerns.

So is kids watching shows just short of soft porn what our country has come to in its programming?

**From:** Nick Reid  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:32 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules.

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners,

After thinking about articles that I have read and heard regarding the proposed changes to the broadcast ownership rules as they currently exist, I see no compelling reason to change what I think has served the public well for years now.

Please consider my opinion as a citizen at large when making your decisions.

With kind regards,

Nick Reid.

---

Protect your PC - Click here for McAfee.com VirusScan Online

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Ronni Marblestone  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:36 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Ronni Marblestone (ronnimarv@earthlinknet) writes:

I am against the expansion of the market share  
that networks or other media outlets can own  
We need many voices of many opinions to hear  
all sides of an issue.  
Let there be competition and may the best programs  
win our minds.  
Don't vote for the expansion of market share.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 165.247.157.91  
Remote IP address: 165.247.157.91

**From:** DeanMont@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps,  
kjweb@fcc.gov  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:38 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

The concentration of opinion shaping media ownership into fewer hands that is an almost certain result of the proposed changes will be to the detriment of our democratic institutions.

I strongly urge you to vote against the proposals at hand.

Dean Montgomery  
11647 River Oaks Trail  
Austin, TX 78753

**From:** Carl & Judith Royal  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:47 PM  
**Subject:** STOP MEDIA DEREGULATION

DEAR COMMISSIONER KATHLEEN Q. ABERNATHY:

Please protect democracy with diversity in entertainment and news coverage.  
Do not allow any single company to own TV stations that reach 45 percent of U.S. households instead of the current 35 percent.

Do not lift existing restrictions preventing "cross ownership".

The air waves belong to the people and should not be monopolized by corporations. The result is likely to be a greater concern

for making large profits rather than providing diverse entertainment and broad coverage of news.

Coverage of this particular issue, the FCC's actions on June 2, 2003, got very little media coverage either in the press or radio/TV. One may ask if this is directly related to the media's self interests. The FCC should hold public hearings and ask for public input before it makes these important decisions.

Your truly, Judith O. Royal, 110 South Kaspar Avenue, Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1761 (847) 259-2838

**From:** Theresa M. Ingram  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:47 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Theresa M. Ingram (A\_Ingram@hotmail.com) writes:

I watched and listened to you on C-SPAN. I support delaying the June vote. I do not want deregulation. Please let the Commission know that this New York voter does not want restrictions lifted. Thank you. (A\_Ingram@hotmail.com is my daughter Alisha's e-mail address)

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.49.223.209  
Remote IP address: 24.49.223.209



**From:** Archuleta  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:51 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Ruling

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

Relaxing the media ownership rules is plain and simply wrong. As it is currently, there is not enough variety on the AM band. I can't imagine what it would be like with this very hateful point of view as we see on AM radio in every form of media. I can only think of two reasons for easing the rules. Number 1, \$ as usual, even at the expense of our democracy. And number 2, almost as important to these same people as the first, political gain. If anything these rules should be reversed from the 1996 ruling.

I think it shameful, despicable and morally wrong to make this kind of change based on such shallow reasoning.

Sincerely,

Anthony Archuleta

**From:** Tom Morris  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:54 PM  
**Subject:** rule change

Please, please allow a real public,publicized debate about the rule change and its consequences concerning media ownership.We are a great nation built on diversity.Already the media giants poorly serve the local news level.

In Pennsylvania,in the 4th largest media market, the May primary was NOT EVEN MENTIONED in three hours of morning news coverage on the NBC affiliate the day before. Not even in a toss to weather "It'll be sunny for tomorrow's primary..". We need more voices with more access,not fewer voices with more money.

An interested voter and citizen,

Patricia Morris

**From:** Lewis Cadkin  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:55 PM  
**Subject:** Vote on Liberalizing restrictions on ownership

We are strongly AGAINST liberalizing rules allowing consolidation of media. Regardless of how you feel about the risks, we do not understand the compelling argument to allow powerful media conglomerates to dominate a market and lessen the independent voices.

There can be no compelling reason that is in the public interest to support this consolidation of power. We can only conclude that this is a decision tied to political contributions and is wholly unacceptable in a democracy.

Lewis Cadkin  
Susan Cadkin

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM)

**From:** Dave N. Falde  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:55 PM  
**Subject:** Opposition to Relaxation of Rules for Media Ownership

As a resident of the State of Minnesota, I am requesting that you, as Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission, oppose the relaxation of ownership rules so that one company cannot own more than one television station or newspaper in a large market such as the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I believe that this change in rules will undoubtedly reduce the amount and diversity of news, opinions, and ultimately, the programming choices available to the citizens of an area. There is much less public affairs reporting of any consequence or quality available in this area than 10 or 20 years ago. I believe this is largely due to the influence of large conglomerate companies who now wield too much power. By changing these rules, large companies will buy out smaller companies--thus reducing the choice my neighbors and I have about the types of news and programs we have to watch, listen to, or otherwise can access.

Thank you for your consideration and opposition to this important issue. I believe that your influence and choice is important to the support of free speech throughout our nation. Please realize your power and responsibility in this decision.

David Falde  
567 Lakewood Drive S.  
Maplewood, MN 55119

**From:** Susan Ginsburg  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:00 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

The media companies are too big already and control what and how we know information. One has to seek out alternatives as things stand now. Don't make it worse. I have worked personally for one of the media tycoons, and I know personally they want to control what we know.

**From:** David Wheeler  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:00 PM  
**Subject:** Deregulation

As a concerned citizen, I am deeply disturbed that my government is considering a change in regulations that would allow the public's airwaves to become the exclusive preserve of a few major media companies. We need a diversity of opinion, perspective, and interpretation as well as a healthy, competitive market to ensure that we are both well informed and in a position to weigh the possible, and even probable, biases of our sources of information. Please cast your vote to preserve diversity in media ownership.

**CC:** Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein